DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 050 613 FL 001 802

AUTHOR Jacobsson, Gunnar
TITLE The Slavic Active Participles: Original Structure and Interference.
PUB DATE 63
NOTE 16p.; Offprint from Scando-Slavica, v9 p123-38 1963

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Adjectives, Contrastive Linguistics, *Diachronic Linguistics, *Form Classes (Languages), Grammar, Greek, Indo European Languages, *Phonemics, Russian, *Slavic Languages, *Verbs

ABSTRACT

A revival of interest in the Slavic participles "-nt-" and "-us-," particularly in their development into gerunds, prompts the author to question whether the forms are to be regarded as nominal or verbal forms in their linguistic classification. The historical problem of linguistic interference in the evolution of the Slavic "-nt-" and "-us-" participles with reference to the interference exerted by Greek on Old Church Slavonic is dealt with in this study in the light of far-reaching consequences of such interference in both Church Slavonic and in modern languages, particularly in Russian. Comparative study involving various languages leads the author to conclude that the "-nt-" and "-us-" found so frequently in Old Church Slavonic are adjectives with pronounced verbality inherited from Indo-European and that it is this verbality which makes participles of them. Extensive morphophonemic documentation supports this article. (RL)

ED050613

From: Scando-Slavica; tomus 9, 1963

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

GUNNAR JACOBSSON:

The Slavic Active Participles: Original Structure and Interference

In this article only the Slavic present participle active and past participle active I will be dealt with, not the past participle active II (the so called *l*-participle). The latter is to be distinguished from the others because of its having been completely incorporated in the verbal system, its short nominative forms making various periphrastic tenses together with the different tenses of the auxiliary verb *byti*. As the question of the connection of the two first-mentioned participles with the verbal system, and at the same time that of their syntactical functions, is however far from unequivocal, these forms occupy a special position; the question arises, in short, as to whether these forms are to be regarded as nominal or verbal.[1]

Although research has always shown a certain interest in the Slavic participles in *-nt-* and *-us-*, it is all the same remarkable how much attention has been given to them during the period from the end of the last World War until now.[2] Not only the diachronic relationships of these participles, in particular their development into gerunds, have stood in the foreground; the synchronic viewpoint too has been applied to their occurrence at different times and in different Slavic languages.

The participles in *-nt-* and *-us-* have been of special interest to research as furnishing examples of linguistic interference in Slavic languages, in particular Old Church Slavonic. Even though a great deal of material and

[1] This article is based on the following papers by the author: a work now in preparation entitled *Le caractère nominal des participes actifs dans les langues slaves (Participe présent actif et participe passé actif I)*, the fundamental ideas of which were put forward at the 1st "Scandinavian Slavicists' Congress" in Århus, Denmark, 1952; *Le suffixe verbal -nǫ- en slave*, Göteborg 1951 (= Göteborgs Kungl. Vetenskaps- och Vitterhets-Samhälles Handlingar. Sjätte följden. Ser. A. Band 4. N:o 4); *Some Remarks on the Origin of the Gerund in Ukrainian*, New York 1960 (= The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U. S., Inc. Volume VIII., 1960, Number 1–2 (25–26), p. 45–54.); "*Participium universale im Slavischen*" (review of Jurij Šerech's paper *Participium universale im Slavischen*) in: Filologiska Meddelanden från Ryska Institutet vid Stockholms Högskola. Nr 1, 1954, p. 1–7 (stencilled).

[2] See, for example, R. Večerka, *Syntax aktivních participií v staroslověnštině*, Praha 1961 (= Spisy University J. E. Purkyně v Brně. Filosofická Fakulta. 75.) and the literature quoted there, p. 154–159.

FL 001 802

many new points of view have been put forward regarding this matter, we are of the opinion that the whole problem of what is genuinely Slavic and what is the result of influence from outside is in need of further investigation.

When ascertaining the authentically Slavic element, which involves establishing the original system of *-nt-* and *-us*-forms in Slavic, one must of course be methodically on one's guard against letting the antiquity of the instances recorded, which are nearly always O. C. S., be the deciding factor.[3] Since a participial system created by interference is met with in O. C. S. par excellence, only the facts in their entirety, from all Slavic languages and from all periods, especially evidence of divergences from the O. C. S. system, are valid for the reconstruction of the authentic Slavic system. One must likewise be careful not to collate individual forms or grammatical categories from a so to speak genetic standpoint, e. g. by presupposing that certain forms, of great antiquity, have died out, being replaced by others said to be newer.

In this article we will be dealing almost exclusively with interference in the Slavic *-nt-* and *-us-* participles with reference to that exerted by Greek on O. C. S., not only because we are confronted there by the oldest recorded written documents, but also because this interference has had far-reaching consequences, both in so called Church Slavonic and in modern Slavic languages, above all in Russian.

There is evidence of external influence on the Slavic *-nt-* and *-us-* participles from other sources and in other Slavic languages as well, but these interferences are not so extensive either chronologically or geographically. Thus for example Latin has set its stamp on the participle in South Slavic and West Slavic. The influence of Italian on South Slavic has also been noted, as has that of German, which however here reflects Latin syntax.[4]

As to the *-nt-* and *-us-* participles in O. C. S., it has been maintained[5] that they are adjectives derived from verbs, inasmuch as they have both nominal and pronominal forms, declined according to gender, number and case. Being adjectives they are in concord to a stated or implied primary element which accordingly determines their flexion.

A special category of *-nt-* and *-us-* participles in concord with an implied primary element are the substantivized forms (almost exclusively pro-

[3] "stsl. nerepresentuje vždy starobylejší stav, přestože jde o doklady chronologicky nejstarší", J. Bauer in: K historickosrovnávacímu studiu slovanských jazyků (Sborník), Praha 1958, p. 117.

[4] J. Bauer, *Vliv řečtiny a latiny na vývoj syntaktické stavby slovanských jazyků* (= Československé přednášky pro IV. mezinárodní sjezd slavistů v Moskvě, Praha 1958, p. 73–95.)

[5] Cf. Večerka, *op. cit.*

nominal) which "in this form are clearly distinct from other types of truly participial constructions."[6] In truly participial constructions the *-nt-* and *-us-* participles can be either attributive or predicative. These forms exhibit their most specifically participial function when acting as (declined) gerunds.

The participial character of the Slavic *-nt-* and *-us-* forms is displayed by the fact that they, as a continuation of the oldest Indo-European participle stock, in addition to being derived from a verb (the tense stem), have voice and the same regimen as the verb they are derived from.

Another feature of the Slavic *-nt-* and *-us-* participles is the great frequency of participle constructions ascribed to interference from Greek. On the question of whether special participle constructions have been directly brought about or impeded by Greek models, scholars are inclined to answer that true copies are few, since the Slavic constructions with *-nt-* and *-us-* participles are in the main of indigenous, Slavic character.

To sum up, it can be said that the *-nt-* and *-us-* forms so frequent in O. C. S. are adjectives with pronounced verbality inherited from Indo-European, and it is just this verbality which makes participles of them.

At the time of the impact of Greek on the Slavic languages, upon which the O. C. S. texts are based, there were thus relatively few essential discrepancies between the system of active participles in the two languages, with the reservation that Greek had a greater number of different participles derived from tense stems.

The picture of the O. C. S. *-nt-* and *-us-* participles as a fundamentally indigenous system justifies a closer examination by means of comparison with other Indo-European languages on the one hand, and with other Slavic languages on the other hand.

Let us consider first of all the notion of the word "participle". It is well known that it is based on a traditional conception which in the last analysis goes back to the Classical grammarians.

With their notion of the participle as an intersection between *nominalia* and *verbalia,* they described rather than defined the participle as a mixed part of speech, whose nominality was of a formal (inflected) nature, but whose other characteristics, i. e. its verbality, coincide with the verb, except for certain grammatical categories such as personal declension.[7]

[6] *Idem*, p. 10.

[7] E. g. Dionysius Thrax: λέξις μετέχουσα τῆς τῶν ῥημάτων καὶ τῆς τῶν ὀνομάτων ἰδιότητος. παρέπεται δὲ αὐτῇ ταῦτὰ ἃ καὶ τῷ ὀνόματι καὶ τῷ ῥήματι, δίχα προσώπων τε καὶ ἐγκλίσεων, which is repeated more or less in the same form by Latin grammarians, e. g. Priscianus: "participium est pars orationis, quae pro verbo accipitur, ex quo et derivatur, naturaliter, genus et casum habens ad similitudinem nominis et accidentia verbo absque discretione personarum et modorum".

Even if the traditional conception embraces the possibility of the participle category being preceded by verbal adjectives less closely connected with the verb both as regards their derivation and meaning, it does not question that Indo-European already had present and past participles active. In cases where various Indo-European languages exhibit these participles on a smaller scale or not at all, this was put down to their having been lost at a later stage.[8]

It is obvious that this notion was based principially on material from the languages rich in participles, Indo-Iranian and Greek, and, to some extent, Latin. The total picture of participles, in particular the *-nt-* and *-us-* participles, presented by the Indo-European languages, including those which were discovered at a later date and were unknown to the first Neogrammarians, upsets the traditional conception however.

In some languages, for example *Armenian*, the *-nt-* and *-us-* formation is completely lacking. The so called participles here are originally wholly nominal, i. e. nouns or adjectives, and lack verbal concepts, that is to say they are indifferent to voice.[9]

Celtic shows no evidence of *-nt-* and *-us-* participles. The existing formations are clearly nominal, as are the *-ōt-* formations which correspond to forms of the perfect participle in for example masc. and neut. in Greek.[10]

Albanian has no *-nt-* or *-us-* participles either. The forms in *-ɛs*, *-es*, which go back to *-nt-* forms, are usually nouns.[11]

Tocharian. The perfect participle active, formed by means of the Indo-European suffix *-us-*, is peculiar in that it is indifferent to voice, that is, it can be either active or passive according to the circumstances. Formations with *-nt-* occur either as present participles active or as true *nominalia*.[12]

The only participle in *Hittite*, an *-nt-* formation, also displays indifference to voice.[13] This peculiarity, which Pedersen[14] sought to explain as an inno-

[8] Brugmann, *Grundriss* II:1, p. 454; 649 sqq; Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax I*², p. 122–123; 283.

[9] A. Meillet, *Esquisse d'une grammaire comparée de l'arménien classique*². Vienne 1936, p. 127 sqq; H. Vogt, *Les formes nominales du verbe arménien* (= Norsk tidskrift for sprogvidenskap, VIII. 1937, p. 45–65).

[10] H. Pedersen, *Vergleichende Grammatik der keltischen Sprachen* I–II, Göttingen 1909–1913. (II, p. 408).

[11] G. Meyer, *Kurzgefasste albanesische Grammatik*, Leipzig 1888, p. 43.

[12] H. Pedersen, *Tocharisch vom Gesichtspunkt der indoeuropäischen Sprachvergleichung*, København 1941, p. 110; 209 sqq.

[13] E. H. Sturtevant, *A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language*, 1933, p. 157.

[14] H. Pedersen, *Hettitisch und die anderen indoeuropäischen Sprachen*, København 1938, p. 148.

vation, comparable to the *-us-* participle in Tocharian, and owing its origin to the loss, in both languages, of participles in *-to-*, has however a parallel in the *Germanic* languages. In Old Icelandic, namely, the *-nd-* participle shows a similar indifference and has no special verbality, but has nominal rection (genitive). This applies to the popular idiom, while the literary language, under the influence of Latin syntax, possesses real participles.[15] The same state of affairs is met with in Old Swedish.[16]

As regards the other Germanic languages, the original state of affairs with respect to the present participle active is the same as in the Scandinavian languages. Both in English[17] and the other West Germanic languages[18] emphasis is laid on the originally adjectival sense of the participle, while the verbal sense of the participle has come into existence under the influence of Latin models.

It has also been a recognized fact for some time that the preference for participle constructions in *Latin*, which interfered to such a great extent in other European languages, is of later date and evolved from Greek models. Early Latin authors like, for example, Plautus offer hardly any forms in *-nt-* with participial meaning—yet another feature comprising a direct link between early Latin and the Romance languages.[19]

It is therefore hardly surprising, against the back-ground of the participles in Indo-European seen as a whole, that voices were raised against regarding the participles as a special grammatical category and demanding instead that they be assigned a place, from the grammatical and semantic viewpoint, among the *nominalia*.[20] Benveniste says straight out "La catégorie du 'participe' comme telle est sans doute moins ancienne qu'il ne semble et moins strictement délimitée".[21]

If we therefore, altering the perspective, deny that the *-nt-* and *-us-* forms in Indo-European are verbal just because they are derived from verbs,

[15] M. Nygaard, *Norrøn Syntax*, p. 247.

[16] M. Ahlberg, *Presensparticipet i fornsvenskan*, Lund 1942.

[17] C. G. Curme, *Development of the Progressive Form in Germanic* (= Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, 28, p. 159 sqq); M. Callaway, *The Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon* (= Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, 16, p. 141 sqq.)

[18] J. Holmberg, *Zur Geschichte der periphrastischen Verbindung des Verbum Substantivum mit dem part. präs. ...*, 1916, p. 17.

[19] J. Marouzeau, *L'emploi du participe présent latin à l'époque républicaine*, Paris 1910.

[20] P. Kretschmer, Glotta 14, 1925, p. 84 sqq; P. Chantraine, *La formation des noms en grec ancien*, Paris 1933, p. 268.

[21] E. Benveniste, *Origines de la formation des noms en indoeuropéen*. I. Paris 1935, p. 126; cf. also V. Machek, Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie 15, 1938, p. 89–90.

and instead take as our starting-point that they are intrinsically nominal, the problem is no longer to account for examples of nominality in various Indo-European languages, preserved often as relics or, as some have insinuated, as a result of a substantivization of verbal characteristics. An elucidation is required, on the contrary, of verbalization, its origins and development.

In our opinion the *-nt-* and *-us-* forms were in Proto-Slavic originally nominal, by which we mean not only that they were declined as nouns but also that they had nominal regimen. Their conversion into *verbalia* was possible because, being derived from verbs, they were drawn into the sphere of the verb in exactly the same way as the infinitive, whose foremost characteristic is shown by distribution analysis to be verbal regimen. These verbal *-nt-* and *-us-* forms are the only ones which should be described as *participles*, but because of the force of tradition it is difficult to maintain a distinction in nomenclature between nominal and verbal (i. e. participles) forms, in *-nt-* and *-us-*.

It is instructive to trace the different notions about participles and their characteristics which have prevailed at different times. Thus the participles have been examined, for example, from the semantic angle, and it has been maintained that temporality is a criterium of verbality, its absence being a characteristic of the adjective. For example, in Serbo-Croat *padajuće* in the phrase *padajuće zvezde* is not a participle, since it does not denote an action taking place at the present time.[22]

As early as 1865, however, N. Nekrasov pointed out that the Russian forms in *-a*, *-ja*, *-ščij* and *-myj*, which he called "deverbative adjectives", had neither temporal meaning nor voice.[23]

Peškovskij too pointed out that the participles in Russian (likewise the infinitive and gerund) were to be regarded as three different parts of speech, connected with the verb only in the sense that they are derived from it, just as *belizna* is connected with *belyj*, *derev'annyj* with *derevo*,[24] a point of view which he however altered later when he classified the above-mentioned forms as belonging to the verb.[25]

Peterson goes still further and even considers the *l*-participle as belonging to the short adjectives.[26]

[22] A. Belić, Naš Jezik 2, 1933, p. 1–6; 5, 1937, p. 129–135.

[23] N. P. Nekrasov, *O značenii form russkogo glagola*, Sankt-Peterburg, 865.

[24] A. M. Peškovskij, *Russkij sintaksis v naučnom osveščenii*[7], Moskva 1956, cf. S. Karcevskij, *Système du verbe russe*, Prague 1927, p. 156.

[25] Naš Jazyk III, 1927 (Karcevskij, *op. cit.*, p. 156, note 2).

[26] *Očerk sintaksisa russkogo jazyka*, Petrograd 1923 (Karcevskij, op. cit. p. 156).

These views, based on an erroneous grammatical interpretation, are also reproduced by Hjelmslev, who does not assign the participle to the verb.[27] Karcevskij quite rightly recognizes that the Russian infinitive, participles and gerund "possèdent tout autant de *glagol'nost'* que le verbe personnel, par cette simple raison qu'ils appartiennent à une même partie du discours".[28]

It is thus quite clear that there is in Slavic one system of nominal *-nt-* and *-us-* forms, not belonging to the verb paradigm and as a result not having verbal regimen, and another system of *-nt-* and *-us-* forms which is verbal, constituting integral parts of the verb. These two systems must be kept distinct as a matter of principle, although in reality this is far from simple, as a continual interchange can take place between them.

With the exception of O. C. S. and the Slavic literary languages influenced by O. C. S., and of those influenced in the last analysis by Latin participial syntax, it is characteristic for Slavic as a whole that it is lacking in *-nt-* and *-us-* participles. What we do find are forms which are by nature wholly nominal—nouns, adjectives and adverbs ("gerunds"). It is well known that Russian was forced to fall back on O. C. S. forms in *-ščij* for the present participle active, while the corresponding forms in *-čij* (which by no means authomatically exist in addition in all verbs) are adjectives. As regards the forms in *-(v)šij* there are of course few phonetic characteristics which can prove their O. C. S. provenance, but it is common knowledge that the popular idiom in Russian, as early as the Old Russian period, is distinguished by the absence of participles in *-ščij* and *-(v)šij* and only possesses the so called gerunds.[29]

Apart from the *-nt-* formations with *-jo-* suffix characteristic of the participles, there are as we know several other formations in Slavic emanating from the consonantic suffix *-nt-*, e. g. C. S. *mogutĭ* 'master', R. *mogutnyj; slovǫtĭ* 'celebrity', which is met with again in O. P. *slawęt-ny* 'famous', U. (fem) *slavuta;* further, river names such as R. *Reuč* (cf. the verb *revu*), *Ržat'* (cf. the verb *ržu*); Cz. adjectives like *ležatý, stojatý, tekutý, visutý;* with *k*-suffix as in S.-C. *vrútak* 'a spring', R. *kip'atok* 'boiling water', P. *majątek* 'property'.[30]

[27] *Principes de grammaire générale*, København 1928, p. 308.

[28] S. Karcevskij, *op. cit.*, p. 157.

[29] S. P. Obnorskij, *Očerki po morfologii russkogo glagola*, Moskva 1953, p. 194.

[30] F. Miklosich, *Vergleichende Grammatik der slavischen Sprachen* II, 1875 (Manulneudruck 1926), p. 203–204; J. Rozwadowski, Materjały i Prace Komisji Językowej Akademji umiejętności w Krakowie 4, 1909, p. 433–487; M. Vasmer, IF 42, 1924, p. 180–182; *Mélanges Holger Pedersen*, 1937, p. 393–396; V. Machek, Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie 15, 1938, p. 88–89.

According to the traditional view these *nominalia* have come into existence owing to the corresponding participles being turned into, respectively, nouns or adjectives. There is, however, absolutely no proof that a participle link ever existed; these *nominalia* can just as well have been derived from the verbs in question, especially since the suffixes sometimes do not have the look of participles, e. g. Cz. *visutý* etc.[31]

That is to say that we include words which have the same form as the present participle active among all the other *-nt-* forms, which of course are not necessarily derived from verbs,—words like, for example O. C. S. *osilę* 'donkey colt', or O. Cz. *bělúcí* 'very white'. The suffix *-nt-* thus by no means stands out as a special participle suffix, but serves very varied purposes as regards derivation.[32]

A typical feature of nominality is the indifference to voice, shown by certain Slavic *-nt-* formations, and this has received due attention. Thus we often meet passive meaning, as in O.Cz. *(od protivenstvie nepřátel všech,) vidúcích i nevidúcích: visibilium et invisibilium.*[33]

In the same category would examples such as the following seem to belong: C. S. *plovuštuju rěku* 'einen fluss, der beschifft wird'; *istočĭnikŭ neizlčrĭpljušti* 'fons inexhaustus'; Slovene: *vedeč, vedejôč* 'notus'[34]. Again, in modern Slavic languages, such as P. *miejsce siedzące, miejsce stojące* 'seat', and 'standing room'. It is making a completely unnecessary detour to explain such expressions as originating in an ellipse, *miejsce dla osób siedzących,* because *siedzące* (and *stojące*), being an adjective without any participial features, can neither express active nor passive; it can only express in adjectival form the meaning inherent in the verb.[35] That is why such examples as S. *šivaća mašina* (Cr. *šivaći stroj*), Cz. *šící stroj* 'sewing machine', and even Polish *tańcująca herbatka* 'thé dansant', are not in conflict with the structure of Slavic languages, even if the examples just cited are based semantically on foreign models.

[31] Machek, *op. cit.* p. 88–89.

[32] Cf. V. Machek, Lingua Posnaniensis I, 1944, p. 87–98, Archiv Orientální 17, 1949, p. 138–141, Zeitschrift für Slawistik VI, 1961, p. 579–587; R. Aitzetmüller, Slavistična Revija III, 1950, p. 289–296, KZ 71, 1953, p. 65–73, Die Sprache III, 1956, p. 131–134; G. Solta, *Gedanken über das -nt- Suffix* (= Österr. Akad. d. Wissensch., Phil.-hist. Klasse. SB 232, 1., Wien 1958); R. Aitzetmüller, review of Solta's paper, IF 65, 1960, p. 71–81; P. Kovaliv, The Slavonic Review 35, 1956/57, p. 562–566.

[33] *Žaltář Klementinský* 139[a] quoted from J. Gebauer, *Historická mluvnice jazyka českého* IV, 1929, p. 588.

[34] F. Miklosich, *Vergleichende Grammatik der slavischen Sprachen* IV, 1868–1874 (Manulneudruck 1926), p. 821.

[35] Cf. A. Obrębska, JP 18, 1933, p. 120–124.

Yet another circumstance which shows the nominal character and independence from the verb of the so called active participles is the fact that they are originally indifferent to aspect. Disregarding those cases in which these forms appear as true participles and can thus express aspect, it is quite clear that *-nt-* forms, in genetic relationship with the corresponding perfective verbs, and *-us-* forms, in genetic relationship with the corresponding imperfective verbs, do no more than express the meaning inherent in the verb, although in another (nominal) form.[36]

The *-nt-* and *-us-* forms reveal their nominal character to a most pronounced degree in the so called gerunds (transgressivum).

The commonest conception of the provenance of these forms has as its starting point what is known as the genetic hypothesis and maintains that they belong to a category, which came into existence at a late date in Slavic, originating in the nominally declined participles, which as the result of their transformation into adverbs, lost concord in number, gender and case. The uninflected gerund form would seem to represent a certain case, usually assumed to be the nominative: i.e. masc. sing. (O.C.S. *byvŭ*, *tvorę*) or plural (O.C.S. *byvŭše*, *tvoręšte*), or fem. sing. (for example R. *iduči*, *davši*). How this transformation into adverbs came about is a matter of dispute, but the majority endorse Potebn'a's view that the participle in the nominative, being in apposition to the subject of the sentence, gravitated towards the predicate and became transformed finally into the "priznak" of the verbal predicate, i.e. the adverb.[37]

A rather different point of view is put forward by Rudnev, who regards the gerund as having been evolved from the participles which were on a par with the verbal predicate. As to its grammatical form, this participle must be nominative; starting as an "odnorodnyj člen" on a par with the predicate, it must later have become an adverb.[38]

It has also been assumed that the gerund in *-e* was nom. sing. neut.[39]

Others consider that the gerund represents various oblique cases with

[36] A. Dostál, *Studie o vidovém systému v staroslověnštině*, Praha 1954, p. 614–617; cf. also E. Hermelin, *Über den Gebrauch der Präsenspartizipien von perfektiven Verben im Altkirchenslavischen*, Uppsala 1935.

[37] A. A. Potebnja, *Iz zapisok po russkoj grammatike*, I–II, Moskva 1958, p. 185 sqq; L. A. Bulachovskij, *Istoričeskij kommentarij k russkomu literaturnomu jazyku*,[5] Kiev 1958, p. 399; L. I. Kolomijeć, *Do pytannja pro formuvannja katehoriji dijepryslivnyka v ukrajins'kij movi* (= Trudy filolohičnoho fakul'tetu Xarkivs'koho Deržavnoho Universytetu, VI, 1958, p. 201–213); R. Večerka, op. cit. p. 148.

[38] A. G. Rudnev, *O proisxoždenii dejepričastija*, Časopis pro slovanské jazyky, literaturu a dějiny SSSR, I, 1956, p. 63.

[39] J. Zubatý, Sborník filologický 3, 1912, p. 153.

adverbial function. Thus, for example, Škarić considers that the forms in *-i* originally reflect the instrumental plural, a not unusual case for adverbs. He maintains that the sociative, comitative meaning is present in the following example from Croatian: *Svatovi odoše kući pjevajući*, where *pjevajući* has the same meaning as *s pjevanjem, s pjesmom*.[40] Forms like S.-C. *greduć, videć* on the other hand would seem to correspond to O.C.S. acc. sing. masc. *grędǫštĭ, vidęštĭ*, with adverbial function, and forms in *-e*, e.g. S.C. *greduće, videće, čuvše, vazamše*, are the counterparts of O.C.S. acc. sing. neut. *grędǫšte* etc, likewise with adverbial function,[41] a point of view put forward earlier by Miklosich.[42] Forms like S.-C. *vide, pomog* are regarded as acc. sing. masc. or possibly neut., which in that case would seem to be older than the forms in *-e*.[43]

We are of the opinion that the theory that the gerund originated in the nominative case as a result of adverbialisation at a later date is based on the assumption that the O.C.S. system, with its relatively few uninflected gerunds, is older than the system represented by the remaining Slavic languages with their conspicuously frequent gerunds of this type. If we, on the other hand, assume that the other Slavic languages represent the authentic Slavic system, while the state of affairs in O.C.S. is the result of interference from outside, the gerund must be regarded as an original form, with more or less adverbial meaning. All the recorded instances (O.C.S. *grędy, znaję, vidę; grędǫšti; grędǫšte, byvŭ* etc) must represent oblique cases, not always identifiable, of *verbal nouns* (nomina actionis).[44]

If, namely, it is assumed that the gerund is a nomen actionis, originally set in a certain oblique case, we are presented with the explanation of constructions like, for example, acc. + gerund, or the dative absolute.

The construction with the acc. + gerund is in our opinion older than the acc. + congruent participle construction. Even supposing that the latter construction is as old, its meaning is different from the acc. + gerund construction. While the acc. + participle reflects a *junction*, or apposition, acc. + gerund constitutes a *nexus*. Examples of a nexus construction with gerund are to be found, although rarely, also in O.C.S., e.g. *jegda vidiši*

[40] Đ. M. Škarić, *Tvorba i poraba participia (gerundia) prezenta aktiva i preterita aktiva I. u čakavskoj književnosti XV. i XVI. vijeka*, Zagreb 1901 (= Nastavni Vjesnik X, p. 31).

[41] *op. cit.*, p. 35.

[42] *op. cit.*, IV, p. 828.

[43] Škarić, *op. cit.*, p. 33; cf. also Zubatý, *op. cit.*, p. 153.

[44] We regard the forms corresponding to O.C.S. *-ę, -ŭ* as possibly reflecting the original locative case without ending, which would point to the antiquity of these forms, cf. our paper *Some Remarks*, p. 53.

učenika prědajǫšte, Supr. 408[19–20], ὅταν ἴδῃς τὸν μαθητὴν προδιδόντα which must actually have meant: 'When you see the the disciple in the betraying'. We thus regard the form in *-e* here as reflecting the locative case, while Škarić assumed it to be the instrumental plural, as mentioned above.

A sign of the antiquity of the nexus construction with the acc. + gerund seems to us to be evident in the fact that the infinitives in *-nǫti* originally reflect a gerund, not identical grammatically with the gerund in *-e*, but representing another declension.[45] As we know, the Baltic languages too have a structurally identical syntagma, e.g. Lithuanian: *àβ jĩ girdėjau giẽ∫tant*, 'ich hörte ihn singen';[46] Latvian: *šk'ita mani sveša mãte nuo lustēm vien dzieduot*, 'mother-in-law thought that I was just singing for pleasure'.[47]

The nexus construction with acc. + gerund is normal after verbs of perception in the literary works least subject to interference by "bookish" syntax, but they are also met with repeatedly in works which are most vulnerable to the influence of Greek and Latin syntax: in the Serbian folk-songs: *nade jadnu gospu kukajući;*[48] in Croatian: *viju sina človičaskoga steći ob desnu kriposti božje;*[49] in Slovene from the 16th century: *inu je vidila Davida krajla ſkazhejozh inu pleſſajozh pred Goſpudom;*[50] in old Czech: *vizi jej na kříži pniece;*[51] in Old Polish: *dzewka Saulowa, patrøc okencem, uzrzala krolya Dauida skaczøci a ygraiøci.*[52] The forms in *-i (-y)* are very rare in Old Polish, the gerund in *-ąc* being the usual form: *a tocz ga vam sza sznamø dagø, ysze nadzecze f gaslach leszøcz dzeczothko;*[53] in Polish dialects: *ꙋostavýꙋ flintą na zymńi leżǫc;*[54] in Old Russian: *vidě smokovĭnicu imušti listvije;*[55] in the Byliny: *tol'ko videli molodcev seduči, // A ne videli udalyx pojeduči.*

[45] Author, *Le suffixe verbal -nǫ-*, p. 7 sqq.

[46] F. Kurschat, *Grammatik der littauischen Sprache*, Halle 1876, p. 376.

[47] J. Endzelin, *Lettische Grammatik*, Riga 1922, p. 794.

[48] A. Musić, *Značenje i upotreba participâ u srpsko-hrvatskom jeziku*, p. 149 (=Rad 250, 1935, p. 127–157).

[49] *Pistule i evangelja*, 16th century, quoted from Miklosich, *op. cit.*, IV, p. 824.

[50] From Dalmatin's Bible, quoted from F. Tomšič, *Poglavje iz slovenske historične sintakse*, Slavistična Revija VIII, 1955, p. 63.

[51] *Hradecký rukopis* 54[a], beginning of the 14th century, quoted from Gebauer, *op. cit.*, IV, p. 601.

[52] *Biblja królowej Zofji* 247 B, quoted from W. Taszycki, *Imiesłowy czynne, teraźniejszy i przeszły I. w języku polskim*, p. 21 (= Rozprawy Wydziału filologicznego Akademji Umiejętności w Krakowie 61:5, 1924).

[53] *Kazania Gnieźnieńskie* 176 b, quoted from Taszycki, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

[54] K. Nitsch, *Dialekty polskie Prus Zachodnich*, quoted from Taszycki, *op. cit.* p. 60.

[55] *Miljatino Evangelije* 1215 *g.*, quoted from A. Sobolevskij, *Lekcii po istorii russkago jazyka*[2], p. 201.

There can be no doubt as to the antiquity and Balto-Slavic origin of the nexus construction with acc. + gerund compared with other constructions with the same meaning. If we take instead the acc. + (congruent) participle construction common in O.C.S., it is difficult to explain why concord was lost so soon in a language group as consistent, from the point of view of concord of case, number and gender, as the Balto-Slavic (leaving on one side the elimination of case in Bulgarian). We are therefore obliged to oppose the view that the acc. + gerund construction has replaced the older construction with acc. + congruent participle, and to assign the gerund construction to the original Slavic system instead. The participle construction is the result of interference, but not an exact copy: the Greek nexus of acc. + congruent participle had a grammatical counterpart in a junction (or apposition) consisting of acc. + congruent *-nt-* or *-us-* form: cf. Russian *ja vižu vis'ačij most* (junction) with *ja vižu udal'cov seduči* (nexus).

A special type of gerund in a nexus is the construction, very common in the Slavic languages, where the accusative is not the subject, but the object, the real subject (or agent) not being stated, for example in Ukrainian: *Mlst'ju bž'ju my knz' veliki Vitovt činim znamenito i daem vedadati*(!) *sim našim listom každomu dobromu ninešnim i potom budučim xto nan' uzrit' ili čtuči eho vslyšit'.*"[56] Old Czech: *všichni, ktož vidie tento list anebo slyšie čtúce.*[57] From a syntactical point of view *čtuči* refers to *eho /list/* but without concord, which would imply "activeness" of the participle and thus make nonsense of the sentence—'who hears it (the letter) reading'. The original meaning of this phrase is of course: 'who hears it in reading' (performed by another person).[58]

Since in the examples cited the agent of the gerund is not stated, it is to be compared to the so called independent gerunds common in all Slavic languages and in all periods, for example in Ukrainian: *A ot toe dorohi pošlo k Tulinam ot horoda a iduči ot horoda po levu Tulinskoe a po pravu Skomoroskoe, ne doxodjači Tulin pol mili Kur''hanci.*[59] Absolute gerunds of this type are present as early as in O.C.S., e.g. *i pověle jego sŭvlěšti i sŭvęzavŭše biti* in Supr. 50[20–21].

The examples of the gerund we have just been dealing with lead us on the dative absolute construction. Without in this article going into the

[56] *Hramota A* (1407) in: V. Rozov, *Ukrajins'ki hramoty XIV i peršoji polovyny XV v.*, I, Kiev 1928.

[57] From 1370, quoted from Gebauer, *op. cit.*, IV, p. 602.

[58] Author, *Some remarks*, p. 50.

[59] Rozov, no. 91.

whole question of the explanation of this phenomenon in Slavic[60] we concur in the now prevailing opinion that the dative absolute as it appears in O.C.S. and later documents based on it is to be explained as being a result of interference by Greek. We do not, on the other hand, endorse the various theories as to how this interference took place, for example Růžička's theory, according to which the Greek model (the genitive absolute) was adapted to the exigences of O.C.S. syntax so that the dative case was often used where the genitive case was to be expected; nor with the many other theories all based on the assumption that the participle functions as a secondary element congruent to the key word in the dative. We agree instead wholeheartedly with V. Polák that the participle does not need to be in concord with the key word in the dative.[61]

A direct parallel to the original Slavic dative absolute construction is to be found in the construction with the infinitive and the subject (agent) in the dative. In a (fictitious) O.C.S. example like *zŭvati mi* 'I have to call' (actually 'to me /is/ to call'), the infinitive is originally a verbal noun in an oblique case signifying "goal, purpose, direction". In the same way, the dative absolute construction must to begin with have been: *zovǫšte mi*, that is to say that instead of a participle which is a secondary element to its key word in the dative and therefore must be in concord with it, we are faced with a verbal noun in an oblique case, (i.e. gerund) which together with the subject (i.e. agent) in the dative forms a nexus. The original meaning must thus have been roughly 'to me /is/ in the calling', i.e. 'I call'. We are of the opinion that the example cited (Ps. Sin. 38[2]), which has been the subject of much discussion, reflects the true Slavic nominal system of *-nt-* and *-us-* forms, having by accident made its way into the verbal (participial) system prevalent in O.C.S. In agreement with this system's demand for consequence, on account of the different structure of the syntagma, the form *zovǫštu* (Pogodianum, Bononiense) has been inserted in other psalters, but it is to be noted that the gerund in the form *zovǫšti* is to be found in another edition from the 13th–14th centuries.[62]

As we know, a similar construction is to be met with in the Baltic languages: an uninflected form (gerund) of the participle with the subject in the dative, e.g. in Latvian: *pajēmu līgavīnu, tēvam, māti nezinīt* 'I took a wife without father, mother knowing'.[63] There is no cause to regard the

[60] We refer for relevant literature to R. Růžička, *Struktur und Echtheit des altslavischen dativus absolutus*, Zeitschrift für Slawistik VI, 1961, p. 588–596.

[61] *Slovanské studie, sbírka prací, věnovaných prelátu univ. profesoru dr Josefu Vajsovi k učtění jeho životního díla*, Praha-Vyšehrad 1948, p. 106–110.

[62] S. Sever'janov, *Sinajskaja psaltyr'*, p. 38, note.

[63] Endzelin, *Lettische Grammatik*, p. 792.

gerund in the Baltic languages as a late form and therefore none why the gerund with the agent in the dative should not be an indigenous construction either.

Thus at the time of the encounter with the Greek genitive absolute Slavic already had a dative absolute, but of different structure. At the same time there were, in the Slavic languages, also constructions where *-nt-* and *-us-* forms, being adjectives, were in concord with a primary element in the dative. Possessing these grammatical possibilities, O.C.S. adapted, under the stimulus of the Greek genitive absolute construction, e.g. *zovǫšte mi* to *zovǫštu mi*, so that *-nt-* and *-us-* forms took on the meaning of participles. The same thing happened in other Indo-European languages having an original construction with gerund and dative agent, which gave way to a dative absolute construction with congruent participle. Cf. for example an autochthonous construction in Old Swedish: *olovandis grannum* 'without the neighbours' permission', an adverbial genitive (gerund) of an *-nd-* form with the agent *grannum* in the dative, while Middle Swedish has the classic dative absolute as a result of interference by Latin.[64]

As we know, what our linguistic instinct now thinks of as the object in the infinitive construction was in reality the subject, e.g. in a Novgorod gramota of 1270 (1269): *a ta gramota knže dati ti nazadŭ* 'and this gramota, O prince, you are to give back' (literally 'and this gramota /is/ to you to give back'). This phenomenon occurs only sporadically in the Slavic and Baltic languages, but there can be no doubt as to its being indigenous.[65] As a result of the verbalisation of the infinitive the syntactical relations in this construction have been altered and the original subject has become the object.

As regards the dative + gerund construction, it is certainly true that we do not encounter the expected subject in the nominative.[66] This is probably owing to the fact that in this case verbalisation took place at an early stage, which was facilitated by the well-known circumstance that in several declensions there was no formal difference between accusative and nominative. The following sentence from *Marianus*, however, may give evidence of the original Slavic construction: *dobrěa ti estŭ vŭniti vŭ životŭ*

[64] M. Ahlberg, *Presensparticipet i fornsvenskan*, p. 19 and 213 sqq.

[65] Cf. V. I. Borkovskij, *Sintaksis drevnerusskich gramot (prostoe predloženie)*, L'vov 1949, p. 338 sqq; V. Kiparsky, *Über das Nominativobjekt des Infinitivs*, Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie 28, 1960, p. 333–342.

[66] We disregard the case, in some Russian dialects, of the feminine nouns in *-a*, where the acc. = the nom., see F. P. Filin, *Ob upotreblenii formy imenitel'nogo padeža imen ženskogo roda na -A v značenii akkuzativa* = B'ulleten' dialektologičeskogo sektora instituta russkogo jazyka. 1, 1947, p. 17–22.

xromu. neže dŭvě nodzě imǫšte vŭvrŭženu byti vŭ ǵeonǫ. (Mc 9:45). *dŭve nodzě /ti/ imǫšte* is to be regarded as an independent noun clause without any copula inserted in the infinitive clause, *dŭvě nodzě* being the subject: 'it is better for you to enter into eternal life as a cripple than—/your/ two feet /are/ to you in the having—be thrown into Gehenna' (Zographensis has here *imǫštju*). We are entirely in agreement with the view that certain Slavic constructions with *-nt-* and *-us-* forms originated in what were from the beginning noun clauses and which later lost their independence and were drawn into a wider context.[67] Article 43 in *Pravda russkaja*, for example, is to be regarded in the same way: *ašče pomostivše most, vzjati ot dela nogata* is originally based on the following construction: 'if a bridge /is/ in the having been built /=*pomostivše*/, a *nogata* /is/ to take for the work'. Or in the chronicle: *tože by namŭ vidjašče* (1230) 'also should everything be in the seeing by us' = 'we should also see everything'.

There seems however to be some evidence of the original construction with agent + subject (in the nominative) + gerund in some Russian dialects, in phrases like: *u mjanjá uš karóva padajívšy* which means the same as *ja uže podoil(a) korovu.* The agent is expressed here by *u (mjanja)*, which corresponds to the dative of the agent. The gerund *padajívšy*, indeclinable as regards gender, case and number, must be understood as being a verbal noun, which is of course indifferent to voice, otherwise the nominative *karova* would be impossible to understand. The original meaning is thus: 'to me /is/ the cow already in the having been milked'.[68]

Even though we have in this article treated the question of the original structure of, and interference with, the Slavic *-nt-* and *-us-* forms only briefly and by no means exhaustively, the principles for the solution of this problem are clearly established. The system of participial *-nt-* and *-us-* forms, evident first and foremost in O.C.S., has thus come into existence as a result of interference at a later date, of course not in such a way that O.C.S. exactly reproduced the Greek models—not even in the case of the dative absolute construction—but so that the language, making use of its own morphological possibilities, developed a system which is not necessarily in contrast to its own evolutionary tendencies.[69]

[67] R. Večerka, *Ke genesi slovanských konstrukcí participia præs, act. a præt. act. I* = Sbornik prací filosofické fakulty brněnské university 1959 A 7, p. 37–49.

[68] Cf. Borkovskij, *op. cit.* p. 78, note 72.

[69] Cf. R. Jakobson, *Sur la théorie des affinités phonologiques des langues* (4th International Congress of Linguistics, Actes, Copenhague 1938); V. J. Rozencvejg i L. M. Uman, *K probleme grammatičeskoj interferencii* (Problemy strukturnoj lingvistiki, Moskva 1962, p. 60–74).

As a result of the contact between the Slavic languages and Greek, the importance and use of the Slavic *-nt-* and *-us-* forms was extended in correspondance with the demands made by new and different, extra-linguistic factors on a language with other referents in the past. The most striking examples of this extension of their importance and use are of course to be met with in the literary genres new to the Slavic languages, and which were taken over from Greek.

But apart from this specialised literature, cultivated by O.C.S. and the languages dependent on it, the original system of *-nt-* and *-us-* forms continued to exist, especially in everyday language and in legal documents etc. However, it is a mistake to presume that the two systems existed side by side, hermetically sealed off from each other; there was on the contrary continual interference between them. The examples of the gerund in O.C.S. must be elucidated on the basis of the interferences between these two systems, and not on the basis of the view of an evolution from congruent participles to uninflected gerunds. The innumerable instances of forms in *-šč-* alongside forms in *-č-*, sometimes nominal, sometimes participial, met with in one and the same document, e.g. in the Russian chronicles, are likewise reflexes of this interference. Nevertheless, on the whole the difference between the two systems corresponds to the difference in literary genres, which can vary in one and the same piece of writing, as Obnorskij has shown so well.[70] Once again we must emphasize the necessity of taking differences in literary genres into account when investigating and drawing conclusions about the *-nt-* and *-us-* forms.

[70] S. P. Obnorskij, *Očerki po istorii russkogo literaturnogo jazyka*, Moskva & Leningrad 1946.